



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,506	02/13/2004	Lee S. Weinblatt	5264-31CIP	8900

7590 03/28/2008
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
Suite 1210
551 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

SHEPARD, JUSTINE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,506

Applicant(s)

WEINBLATT ET AL.

Examiner

Justin E. Shepard

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/18/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 21, 22, and 23 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 10/080,949. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: transmitting coupons to television viewers that are displayed/printed at the viewer's home.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holman in view of Chang.

Referring to claim 1, Holman discloses an interactive method for generating a supplementary, program-related output (figure 1), comprising:

- obtaining a programming signal (column 6, lines 5-12);
- obtaining a supplementary, program-related data signal (column 9, lines 10-32);
- combining said programming signal and said supplementary, program-related data signal into a broadcast signal (column 9, lines 10-32);
- broadcasting said broadcast signal from a program signal source (figure 2, part 33);
- receiving said broadcast signal (column 6, lines 5-12);
- performing said programming signal of the received broadcast signal with reproduction equipment for an audience (column 6, lines 5-12);
- storing said supplementary, program-related data signal of the received broadcast signal on a storage media (column 6, lines 20-36);

enabling retrieval of rewards data corresponding to products or services by accessing said stored supplementary, program-related data signal from said storage media (column 6, lines 39-64); and

selecting a reward from said retrieved rewards data (figure 1).

Holman does not disclose a method wherein the storage media is a portable storage media.

In an analogous art, Chang teaches a method wherein the storage media is a portable storage media (paragraph 23).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the portable storage media taught by Chang to the method disclosed by Holman. The motivation would have been to enable the available storage to be expanded by purchasing more memory cards.

Claims 14, 21, 22, and 23 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Referring to claim 2, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 1, wherein said supplementary, program-related data signal includes all data necessary to produce a human-perceptible output (figures 1 and 5).

Claim 15 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 2.

Referring to claim 3, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 2, further comprising the step of authorizing eligibility for said selected reward based on said

Art Unit: 2623

stored supplementary, program-related data signal (column 16, line 55 to column 17, line 6).

Claim 16 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 3.

Referring to claim 4, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 3, further comprising the step of storing validation indicia on said portable storage media, said validation indicia corresponding to a validation of the selected reward (column 16, line 55 to column 17, line 6).

Claim 17 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 4.

Referring to claim 5, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 4, wherein said selecting step comprises displaying said retrieved rewards data on a human-perceptible display (figure 1).

Claim 18 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 5.

Referring to claim 6, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 5, wherein said human-perceptible output produced from said reward data signal is a discount coupon (column 6, lines 20-38).

Referring to claim 7, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 4, further comprising the step of displaying at least a portion of said stored supplementary,

program-related data on a display device remote from said reproduction equipment (column 8, lines 45-46).

Claim 19 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 7.

Referring to claim 8, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 7, wherein said authorizing eligibility step comprises a step of comparing said stored supplementary, program-related data to said selected reward to determine compatibility and, if compatibility, is determined, storing said validation indicia on said portable storage media (column 16, line 55 to column 17, line 6).

Referring to claim 9, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 8, wherein said authorizing eligibility step comprises a step of comparing said stored supplementary, program-related data to said selected reward to determine compatibility and, if compatibility is determined, printing a discount coupon corresponding to said selected reward (column 16, line 55 to column 17, line 6; column 8, lines 45-46).

Referring to claim 12, Holman discloses an interactive method of claim 9, further comprising the step of deleting data from said portable storage media for preventing access to multiple occurrences of said selected reward upon one of the printing of a discount coupon and the storing of the validation indicia (column 16, line 55 to column 17, line 6; column 8, lines 45-46; column 13, lines 52-57; column 8, lines 45-46).

Claims 10, 11, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holman in view of Chang as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Ben-David.

Referring to claim 10, Holman and Chang do not disclose an interactive method of claim 7, wherein said remote display device comprises a personal computing device.

In an analogous art, Ben-David teaches an interactive method of claim 7, wherein said remote display device comprises a personal computing device (paragraph 116).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the PDA taught by Ben-David to the method disclosed by Holman and Chang. The motivation would have been to enable the user to carry a plurality of coupons without the bulk of carrying paper coupons.

Claim 20 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 10.

Referring to claim 11, Holman and Chang do not disclose an interactive method of claim 7, wherein said remote display device comprises a public computing device.

In an analogous art, Ben-David teaches an interactive method of claim 7, wherein said remote display device comprises a public computing device (paragraph 116).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the portable computing unit taught by Ben-David to the method disclosed

by Holman and Chang. The motivation would have been to enable the user to carry a plurality of coupons without the bulk of carrying paper coupons.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holman in view of Chang as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Reams.

Referring to claim 13, Holman and Chang do not disclose an interactive method of claim 12, wherein said selecting step comprises using said stored supplementary, program-related data signal to access information through the Internet.

In an analogous art, Reams teaches an interactive method of claim 12, wherein said selecting step comprises using said stored supplementary, program-related data signal to access information through the Internet (figure 1; paragraph 10).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the internet download coupon taught by Reams to the method disclosed by Holman and Chang. The motivation would have been to enable a more complicated coupon than transmission over a low bandwidth channel such as the VBI would have allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2623

JS